



Docket No.: 101-1024

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/812,965

Confirmation No.: 4873

Applicants : Young-chol LEE, et al.

Filed : March 31, 2004

Group Art Unit: 2851

Customer No. : 38209

Examiner: Magda Cruz

Title: INTEGRATOR MODULE WITH A COMPACT LIGHT SOURCE AND PROJECTION
DISPLAY HAVING THE SAME (as amended)

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.104

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner provided a Statement of Reason for Allowance in the Notice of Allowance and Fee Due mailed December 22, 2005, in which the Examiner indicated that "the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest an integrator module wherein the incident portion comprises a parabolic first reflective surface to collimate the light beam radiating from the at least one compact light source, and the at least one compact light source is located in the vicinity of a focal point of the first reflective source and an integrator module wherein the incident portion comprises a first reflective surface and a second reflective surface to reflect a first portion of the light beam emitted from the light source and to reflect a second portion of the light beam reflected by the first reflective surface, respectively, and the light source is disposed at a focal point of the first reflective surface."

As specified in MPEP 1302.14, "care must be taken to ensure that such reasons are accurate, precise, and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow, upon the claims." It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Statement is not an accurate quote with respect to each of the allowed claims, and instead, raises "possible misinterpretations, and possible estoppel effects" (MPEP 1302.04) and accordingly, should be disregarded.


Serial No.: 10/812,965
Docket No.: 101-1024
Reply to the Notice of Allowance of December 22, 2005

The Examiner's statement appears to unnecessarily limit the claims to the integrated module having a parabolic first reflective surface or first and second reflective surfaces as the Examiner stated above. While being useful in understanding the invention, the Examiner's comments could lead to an unwarranted and unnecessary narrowing interpretation of the claims. Therefore, it is further submitted that the claims should not be interpreted based on the Examiner's statement.

It is further submitted that the claims are not constrained by such device limitations and that the claims speaks for themselves as to what features are included therein and are their own best evidence as to the reasons for allowance of same.

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: March 9, 2006
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
Seungman Kim
Registration No. 50,012